

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The final Office Action dated January 24, 2006 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed. Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter in claims 10, 13 and 16.

Claims 1-20 are currently pending, of which claims 17-20 are withdrawn from consideration. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 9, and 11-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Becker et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,340,644) in view of Fujiwara et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,905,559) and ARA (Fig. 3 of Applicants' Related Art); rejected claims 6-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Becker et al. and Fujiwara et al. in view of Kitamura et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,139,639); and rejected claims 14-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over ARA in view of Minami et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,776,845).

The rejection of claims 1-5, 9 and 11-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Becker et al. in view of Fujiwara et al. and ARA is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 1 is allowable over the cited references in that each of these claim 1 recites a combination of elements including, for example, "...an image camera detecting an image of the seal pattern by varying the position of the table..." None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 and claims 2-5, 9 and 11-12, which depend from claim 1, are allowable over the cited references.

Applicants respectfully submit that in order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the prior art references when combined must at least teach or suggest all the claim elements. In the present application, the image camera detects an image of the seal pattern, which is dispensed from a syringe, to determine whether there is any discontinuous portion of the seal pattern. However, as best understood, the camera 5 in Fig. 1 of Becker et al. is used to detect a size of the caverns *before* dispensing a protective resist from the syringe 4.

[emphasis added] *See Becker et al.* claim 15 at Col. 8, lines 22-31. Further, as previously presented, because Becker et al. does not disclose a seal dispenser for fabricating a liquid crystal display panel, Applicants respectfully submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to combine the references with reasonable expectation of success, and that to do so would be considered impermissible hindsight.

The rejection of claims 6-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Becker et al. and Fujiwara et al. in view of Kitamura et al. is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Because Kitamura et al. fails to cure the deficient teaching of Becker et al. and Fujiwara et al. as discussed with respect to claim 1, claims 6-8, which depend from claim 1, are allowable over the cited references.

The rejection of claims 14-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over ARA in view of Minami et al. is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 14 is allowable over the cited references in that each of these claim 14 recites a combination of elements including, for example, "...detecting an image of the seal pattern by changing the relative position between the image camera and the substrate..." None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 and claim 15, which depends from claim 14, are allowable over the cited references.

Applicants believe the application is in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited. If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37

C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: April 24, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Rebecca Goldman Rudich

Registration No.: 41,786

McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 496-7500

Attorneys for Applicant